

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CRIMINAL MINUTES—GENERAL

Case No. CR 24-00621-MWF-6 Date November 3, 2025

Present: The Honorable J. MICHAEL SEABRIGHT, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE Page 1 of 1

Interpreter N/A

Derek Davis

None Present

None Present

Deputy Clerk

Court Reporter

Assistant U.S. Attorney

<u>U.S.A. v. Defendant(s):</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Cust.</u>	<u>Bond</u>	<u>Attorneys for Defendant(s):</u>	<u>Present</u>	<u>Appt.</u>	<u>Ret.</u>
Durk Banks	NOT			None Present			

Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) ORDER

On October 6, 2025, Defendant Durk Banks filed a Motion to Dismiss the Indictment and to Disqualify Based on the Unlawful Designation of Bilal A. Essayli as U.S. Attorney for the Central District of California. *See* ECF No. 228. On October 7, 2025, the court stayed consideration of that Motion pending a decision on similar Motions to Dismiss and to Disqualify in three other cases, *United States v. Ramirez*, Case No. 5:25-cr-264-SSS, *United States v. Garcia*, Case No. 2:25-cr-655-MEMF, and *United States v. Rojas*, Case No. 22-cr-573-FWS. *See* ECF No. 243. On October 28, 2025, the court ruled in a consolidated order on those similar Motions. *See United States v. Ramirez*, --- F. Supp. 3d ---, 2025 WL 3019248 (C.D. Cal. Oct. 28, 2025). The court is inclined to rule the same way on Defendant Banks' Motion and simply refer to the *Ramirez* Order for the court's reasoning.

Defendant Banks, however, may file an optional statement limited to seven pages explaining why the court would not be bound by its ruling in *Ramirez*. That is, Defendant Banks is allowed to explain how his particular case is distinguishable from the ruling in *Ramirez* (but may not attempt to re-argue the findings or conclusions the court made in *Ramirez*). Such a statement is due by **November 14, 2025**. If Defendant Banks files a statement, the court will decide whether to request a response from the government.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

cc: DMG_Chambers